1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 3 IN RE CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT) Master File No. 3:07-md-05944-SC 4 ANTITRUST LITIGATION MDL No. 1917 5 This Document Relates To: [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING 6 DIRECT ACTION PLAINTIFFS' Best Buy Co, Inc. v. Technicolor ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO SEAL 7 SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05264; PORTIONS OF THEIR OPPOSITION TO MITSUBISHI'S MOTION TO DISMISS 8 PURSUANT TO CIVIL LOCAL RULES 7-Siegel v. Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-11 AND 79-5(d) 00141; 9 Costco Wholesale Corp. v. Technicolor SA, et 10 al., No. 13-cv-05723; 11 Electrograph Systems, Inc. v. Technicolor SA, 12 et al., No. 13-cv-05724; 13 Interbond Corp. of Am. v. Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05727; 14 15 Office Depot, Inc. v. Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05726; 16 P.C. Richard & Son Long Island Corp. v. 17 Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05725; 18 Sears, Roebuck & Co. v. Technicolor SA, et 19 al., No. 13-cv-05262; 20 Schultze Agency Services, LLC v. Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05668; and 21 22 Target Corp. v. Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13cv-05686 23 24 25 26 27 28

1	On January 27, 2014, Plaintiffs Best Buy Co., Inc.; Best Buy Purchasing LLC; Best Buy
2	Enterprise Services, Inc.; Best Buy Stores, L.P.; BestBuy.com, L.L.C.; Magnolia Hi-Fi, LLC;
3	Alfred H. Siegel (as trustee of the Circuit City Stores, Inc. Liquidating Trust); Electrograph
4	Systems, Inc.; Electrograph Technologies Corp.; Interbond Corporation of America; Office
5	Depot, Inc.; Costco Wholesale Corporation; P.C. Richard & Son Long Island Corporation; ABC
6	Appliance, Inc.; MARTA Cooperative of America, Inc.; Schultze Agency Services, LLC, (on
7	behalf of Tweeter Opco, LLC, and Tweeter Newco, LLC); Sears Roebuck and Co. and Kmart
8	Corp.; and Target Corp., (collectively "Plaintiffs") filed an Administrative Motion to Seal
9	Portions of Amended Complaints Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5(d) to file under
10	seal the highlighted portions of the following documents:
11	• Direct Action Plaintiffs' Opposition to Mitsubishi's Motion to Dismiss Complaints
12	("Opposition")
13	Having read and considered the papers filed and arguments made by counsel, and good
14	cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Administrative Motion to Seal
15	Portions of Their Opposition to Mitsubishi's Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Local Civil Rules 7-
16	11 and 79-5(d) is GRANTED.
17	
18	IT IS SO ORDERED
19	
20	Dated:
21	Hon. Samuel Conti UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	